

Background Paper

CANADIAN INSTITUTE
FOR INTERNATIONAL
PEACE AND SECURITY

Number 6

CA 1
IPS 2
- 86 B06

August 1986

THE ORIGINS OF THE CANADIAN INSTITUTE FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY

by Gilles Grondin



"Improving the climate among nations requires knowledge, creativity and a determination to find solutions. Reflecting Canada's concern about international tensions, the Government will create a publicly funded centre to gather, collate and digest the enormous volume of information now available on defence and arms control issues. Fresh ideas and new proposals, regardless of source, will be studied and promoted."

These words in the Speech from the Throne read by Governor General, Edward Schreyer on 7 December 1983, announced the Government's intention to propose to Parliament the creation of an Institute whose mission would be to promote public understanding of the complex issues relating to issues of defence, arms control and disarmament. Consultations between the Prime Minister and the Leaders of the Opposition Parties identified a large number of essential points on which a general consensus existed, including the necessity for the future organization to be independent. As a result, a Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 16 April 1984, and sent to the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence for examination and advice. The Committee heard 63 witnesses from the private and public sectors. A text was produced by the Committee that proved acceptable to all Parties: it was adopted unanimously in the House on 28 June 1984 as Bill C32.

Section 4 of the Act entrusts the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security with the following responsibilities:

"to increase knowledge and understanding of the issues relating to international peace and security from a Canadian perspective, with particular emphasis on arms

control, disarmament, defence and *conflict resolution*, and to

- foster, fund and conduct research on matters relating to international peace and security;
- promote scholarship in matters relating to international peace and security;
- study and propose ideas and policies for the enhancement of international peace and security;*
- collect and disseminate information on, and encourage public discussion of, issues of international peace and security."

The italicized words constitute new elements which were added as a result of discussions in the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence.

These additions have far-reaching implications, in that they give the topic of "conflict resolution" a value equal to that bestowed by the original text on the subjects of arms control, disarmament and defence. They also empower the Institute to become, through its research, the initiator of ideas or policies capable of advancing the cause of international peace and security.

The Parliamentary debate resulted in substantial changes to the original objectives pursued by the Government. The Institute was told to probe beyond the superficial reasons for war to the underlying causes of all armed conflicts; the Parliamentary debate also made possible, through the insertion of clause c), active Institute participation in public or Government discussions on the full range of on-going issues. Finally, the inclusion of the expression "from a Canadian perspective" in the main part of the section rather than in its last paragraph as was previously the case, emphasized the require-

ment that the new Institute strive, in all its activities, to discern the specific part that Canada could play in reducing tensions and restoring stability.

All the witnesses who appeared before the Standing Committee took as their starting point the question of how to identify the most promising route leading to international peace and security, since the general direction that the Institute should take would depend upon how one answered that question. An analysis of the testimony reveals three distinct trends:

- 1) some pleaded the need to maintain a credible deterrent without thereby excluding simultaneous action in other areas, such as arms control or even disarmament;
- 2) others emphasized the necessity to strive relentlessly for complete, radical and unconditional disarmament, in the belief that the mere possession of weapons elicited an irresistible temptation to use them;
- 3) a third group argued that acting, whether negatively or positively, upon the armaments equation alone could produce nothing more than a simple absence of war and that for the world to attain real peace, one must try to understand the underlying causes of international conflict.

It will be seen from the above that whereas the participants in groups 1 and 2 placed great importance on the question of security, whether they believed that this could be achieved by maintaining a plausible deterrent or by pursuing a policy of total disarmament, the third group emphasized the need to deal with the underlying cause of all conflict, namely injustice. It was only by doing this, in their opinion, that "peace" in any real sense could be attained. The fact that both words "peace" and "security" were used to identify the Institute gave expression to the extent to which the discussion in the committee centred on those two ideas.

The committee also considered whether the Institute should play an activist or "interventionist" role on either the national or the international scene. Should it promote specific policies or should it confine itself to disseminating the results of its research? A number of suggestions were made on this subject which are discussed later in this paper.

SECURITY

a) *Security Through Deterrence*

None of those who provided the committee with either oral or written testimony advocated unlimited expenditure on defence.

Admiral Robert Falls, former Chairman of the NATO Military Committee declared himself to be "a very firm believer in deterrence" because "at the

moment, there does not seem to be any answer or any alternative that would keep the peace in the world." He was concerned, however, about the risks involved in pursuing this policy beyond certain limits — "how many times does one need to have overkill?" In his view it was sufficient to have at one's disposal the nuclear retaliatory strike capability provided by an undetectable strategic submarine force. He wondered whether other nuclear systems were not superfluous and could be disposed of without significant risk, unilaterally if necessary. He believed that the Canadian military took "an objective view" of such issues, unlike the military of some other nations who were "automatically" against "anything that had to do with the lessening or trade-offs" in weapons systems.

In the same vein, General George Bell, President of the Canadian Institute for Strategic Studies spoke of "the need for comprehensive political, economic and military security Contemporary strategy in the international debate has, for some time, been centered on strategic nuclear weapons, intermediate nuclear weapons and conventional forces and the military balance between East and West We are becoming increasingly aware of the need for a comprehensive Western Alliance Strategy, comprising the political and economic dimensions, as well as the military dimension."

Mr. Arthur Menzies, formerly Canada's Ambassador to NATO and Ambassador for Disarmament, also underlined the need for deterrence; in addition, he spoke in favour of arms control measures and of policies aimed at disarmament and the settlement of conflicts. He summarized his views as follows:

" . . . the Canadian security policy is (was) based on three foundations of peace: first, deterrence of war through the collective security arrangements of NATO and NORAD; second, a persistent search for equitable and verifiable arms control and disarmament agreements; and thirdly, active participation in and support for the peaceful settlement of disputes and peacekeeping supporting that, and a collective effort to resolve the underlying economic and social causes of international tensions and disputes."

Mr. Menzies also spoke of bringing out:

" . . . the Canadian dimension of international peace."

In reply to a question on unilateral disarmament he emphasized that Canada would have to go

through "quite a protracted process" to detach itself from existing ties with the United States and NATO and that to maintain a "non-aligned" position such as that of Sweden would be very expensive and could mean "paying three times as much, at least, for defence as we are now".

George Ignatieff, also a former ambassador to NATO, said that while he did not think "deterrence has completely failed", "deterrence in itself creates the treadmill of ever-increasing armament." It has also created greater reliance on automation, which in turn can and does carry risks of war by accident.

What, then, is the solution? Mr. Ignatieff as well as the "Science for Peace" association of which he is a member, recommended an Institute: a) which, through scientific studies, independently carried out, would challenge the strategic or tactical rationale for the various weapons systems deployed for defence with a view to eliminating those elements that are particularly dangerous and destabilizing; and b) which would not restrict its research to military questions, but would exercise its imagination and have the courage to challenge traditional ideas (mainly held by the military or diplomatic establishments, interested as these are in preserving the status quo), and to open new avenues, for instance by trying to identify the specific contributions that the political, social, economic, psychological and ethical sciences could make towards international stability.

Later, in the debate on the Bill, Pauline Jewett of the New Democratic Party accepted the clause allowing the Institute to study defence as such, although she indicated that she would have preferred not to have seen the inclusion of this subject matter among the main preoccupations of the new organization.

From the foregoing it may be concluded that none of the witnesses who supported deterrence argued that it was an absolute value *per se*: on the contrary, everyone recognized, either explicitly or implicitly, that deterrence should be accompanied with measures designed to avoid fear and instability, and to promote better means of control.

b) Security Through Disarmament

Several organizations opposed the policy of deterrence described above, stating forcefully that security could only be achieved through disarmament; that weapons should be banned as the *sine qua non* of warfare, and that no defence was possible against thermonuclear attack. Consequently it would be unreasonable, in their view, for the Institute to waste time studying insoluble problems; the Institute would do better to concentrate its efforts on changing attitudes and diverting the enormous sums of money currently poured into the

bottomless pit of an impossible defence towards meeting the crying needs of the under-developed world.

Jim Stark, Director of Operation Dismantle, talked of "security through disarmament" as a "revolutionary" idea with which it was very hard for people to deal. He believed that the least qualified to pursue the implications of this concept were "those with a vested interest in the military establishment."

Frank Kennedy, President of End the Arms Race spoke of the need for "Canada's policies to be consistent with achieving world peace through disarmament." He believed Canada should help to freeze the arms race by refusing to test the Cruise Missile. It should also set "an example in becoming a nuclear weapon-free zone."

Anne Adelson of the Toronto Disarmament Network maintained disarmament was unlikely to take place "if it must wait for the initiatives of governments and experts." "Its precondition is simply a constructive interplay between the people and those taking momentous decisions about armament and conducting the negotiations." In view of this she felt it was "extremely important" that the "Institute not be isolated from the public at large and the Canadian peace movements" and that it not be "solely responsible to Parliament" which might lead it "to produce information that supports its (Parliament's) policies".

Finally, other people like Mr. William Epstein, for many years a member of the UN Secretariat, while making it clear they were not in favour of unilateral disarmament, were emphatic that unilateral initiatives should be taken for the purpose of promoting disarmament.

c) Security Through Conflict Resolution

Various witnesses expressed surprise that the section of the Bill dealing with the role of the new organization did not contain anything to suggest that peace lay beyond the boundaries of research restricted to issues of arms control, disarmament and defence. They argued that global conditions made it urgent that the dialogue between the superpowers and their allies should deal with more than the mere symptoms of the current international crisis, which was what discussions about armaments amounted to. It was essential to take up those issues which were at the core of East-West problems, forming the Great Divide that separated the two worlds: ideological, cultural or economic "imperialism" of all kinds and the serious tensions generated between Governments and the governed, and between various political communities. A number of witnesses spoke eloquently on this theme.

Paul McRae, the Liberal member for Thunder Bay expressed the hope that the proposed Institute would interest itself in conflict resolution.

"Let us go back to this statement that I have been using — you know, the cartoon with two men knee-deep in gasoline, one with seven matches and one with nine matches, and arguing back and forth about whether the matches are bigger, and so on. Some people are beginning to think that maybe the match argument is going no further, that the arms control thing is not getting anywhere, so maybe we should be worrying about getting the gasoline out of the tank. There is that sort of idea that conflict resolution may very well be a better approach than the arms control argument."

Similarly, Kay MacPherson of the Voice of Women said that her organization could support the Institute "if it seems to be doing something in the area of conflict resolution and moving towards peace." She stressed the need for the Institute to do "something that is going to be different . . . going to be imaginative about what the world might be like, not about what the world is like right now."

This need of an innovative approach was echoed by Norman Alcock of the World Federalists of Canada who saw "a golden opportunity" to establish something quite new: "a middle-power institute with sufficient freedom to explore new innovative ideas and in the software area."

Another element in the testimony was a general feeling that questions of disarmament and arms control could not be satisfactorily addressed without reference to the deeper underlying issues of social and economic justice.

Murray Thomson of Project Ploughshares reminded the committee of the recommendation of the Brandt Commission that the world needed a more comprehensive understanding of security which would go well beyond its military aspects. Representatives of the Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops and other Canadian Church leaders agreed on the impossibility of "building a peaceful world or a world of security unless we are prepared to deal with questions of injustice."

Professor Humphrey of the Canadian Human Rights Foundation was concerned that the mandate given the Institute should not be directed solely to the problem of disarmament and arms control, important as that was, but to the "deep-seated social and political malaise" of which the arms race was a symptom.

Various people thought that the Institute could

play a useful role in studying what a spokesman for the Canada-Arab Federation described as "the social and historical underpinnings of conflict." Ernie Regehr of the Mennonite Central Committee described peace as "something that emerges out of conditions of justice in the world" and spoke of the need to "enlarge on our understanding of the notion of what security is and what the conditions and requirements of security are." Alan Rose of the Jewish Congress warned, however, against thinking one could "discuss peace without dealing with security" or that the issue of human rights could be addressed without reference to the Helsinki Final Act. He thought one useful task for the Institute would be to study "a whole litany of concerns that relate to covenants signed and violated by the Soviet Union."

Many witnesses examined ways in which the Institute could provide valid and lasting solutions to international problems. It was agreed that the Institute should conduct a programme of research either by itself or "in collaboration with other Canadian or international institutions." Professor Henry Wiseman, of Guelph University, emphasized that the Institute would not "develop a Canadian identity and perspective unless it does research and develops responses to issues that are distinctly Canadian and in response to Canadian needs." It should do some of this research in house, otherwise it would not "gain the credibility that it must have" but it should also encourage scholars across the country to undertake research. A long list of topics was suggested for such research.

The Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops quoted Pope John Paul II on the "need for world society to develop effective means of negotiation and provide itself with those instruments of coordination and dialogue which it needs to ensure its survival."

Douglas Roche, then a Member of Parliament and later to be Canada's Ambassador for Disarmament, spoke of the need to promote "international policies that would allow the present system of deterrence to be replaced by a programme of collective security", and Norman Alcock of the World Federalists of Canada urged the Institute to study the relationship between disarmament and security. In the event of disarmament there would be a need to establish stronger international institutions and permanent peace-keeping forces. "We cannot have nuclear or conventional disarmament unless we set in place at the same time alternative security systems."

A spokesman for the United Nations Association suggested a study of the role and activities of the United Nations as "one area of focus for the Institute."

Among other topics suggested for research were human rights, links between disarmament and

international development, techniques of conflict resolution and reduction of tension, and practical approaches for negotiating with the Russians. The spokesman for Science for Peace suggested the need to study the psychological aspects of such negotiations. Dr. H. Newcombe of the Peace Research Institute — Dundas emphasized the need for peace education and another witness suggested that the chief products of peace research should be materials for peace education. In conducting its research the Institute should be responsive to good ideas from private people.

THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE INSTITUTE

The need for the Institute to have freedom of thought and action was recognized even before the Bill was introduced in the House of Commons on 16 April 1984. During the spring of 1984, letters were exchanged between Prime Minister Trudeau, on the one hand, and the leaders of the Progressive Conservative Party, Brian Mulroney, and the New Democratic Party, Edward Broadbent, on the other, on the range of problems that the planned organization might encounter. In a letter dated 9 April 1984, Mr. Mulroney wrote:

“The creation of a new institute should be directed towards ensuring that this search (on peace and security issues) is conducted in the best possible manner, and that peace and security is not allowed to become the province of one political viewpoint, one party or one perspective. Pluralism of ideas and pluralism of research cannot but be applauded and encouraged. But that pluralism must be both real and enduring. This implies that what a Canadian Government seeks to create in this area must ensure that its research and public information are protected from its prevailing political winds, and that Canadian research done elsewhere in the country is not distorted to conform to these prevailing winds”.

On 12 April 1984, Mr. Trudeau replied in the following terms:

“I agree that Canadians should see the Institute as apolitical and should have confidence in its objectivity. Indeed, I envisage the Board as being composed of men and women who are knowledgeable in the field, and who can be relied upon to carry out their functions in a completely

non-partisan manner. Mr. MacEachen and I have agreed, therefore, that the Government would seek nominations from the Opposition parties, as you suggested, before any recommendation were made to the Governor in Council with regard to the appointment of members of the Board.”

This procedure for nominating members of the Board of the Institute through consultations with the Opposition parties and with non-governmental organizations, as well as the method of financing through Parliamentary grants, were perceived by witnesses as an effective means of ensuring the financial independence of the new Crown Corporation and of consolidating its freedom of action. As the Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Allan MacEachen, said on the occasion of the third reading of Bill C-32 in the Commons on 28 June 1984:

“There was a great deal of concern that the Institute be non-partisan and independent. It certainly was never my view that it should be anything but non-partisan, and independent, and objective. It has been given that role. Indeed, we have it guaranteed in law that the Leaders of all recognized Parties in the House of Commons will continue to have a voice in deciding the board’s membership. By legislating an annual endowment we have given the Institute a means by which it can preserve independence of a certain quality.”

This question of the Institute’s autonomy arose again on 11 September 1985, during the House debate on an amendment aimed at strengthening the Institute’s independence. The Secretary of State for External Affairs, Mr. Joe Clark, stated:

“[The Institute] is dealing with issues which are at the heart and focus of our own attention and indeed the most urgent and important issues that any of us in public life can address. The seeking of independence from Parliament for the Institute is not an indication of a lack of interest on the part of Parliamentarians. Quite the contrary: it is a recognition that on issues of this kind, if we want in fact to rise above the kinds of partisan considerations that sometimes properly and naturally engulf this House, there must be the certainty that there is an agency in Canada able to look at these questions and offer

advice and observations without the suspicion that it is the instrument of a Party, a faction or a particular perspective. That was the earnest desire of all Members of the House when the Institute was established."

Pauline Jewett, the New Democratic Party critic for external relations, replied to Mr. Clark as follows:

"As the Minister has pointed out and as we all felt very strongly a year ago June when this Bill was passed and the Institute was being created, it is absolutely essential that the Institute be independent of Government both in terms of the membership of the Institute board and its financial support. The final amendment which will relieve the Institute from certain provisions of the Financial Administration Act was our intention all the time. To that extent, the amendment tidies up something that was always intended.

Jean Chrétien, the Liberal Party critic on international relations, also reminded the House that:

"We established that Institute, and when it was set up we tried to find a formula that would have its operations as far removed from partisanship as possible. There were amendments suggested from various quarters, and this is a completely non-partisan Institute that is playing a positive role."

THE ROLE OF THE INSTITUTE

Although there was unanimity on the absolute necessity of independence, opinions were divided on whether the Institute should, or even could, advocate specific policies. Some wanted an Institute that would be activist, even deliberately interventionist; that is, not only willing to criticize the doctrines and the practices of the government of the day, but also empowered to propose explicit alternatives and strategies, that would include clearly formulated plans of action. Others were opposed to this concept, insisting that the Institute should not try to compete with the advice given by officials unless it were explicitly asked to give such advice. Rather, the Institute should seek to compel recognition through the quality of its research, and the forcefulness, relevance, impartiality and objectivity of its conclusions and recommendations.

Among those who argued for an activist role was Jim Stark of Operation Dismantle. He doubted the point of the exercise "if it cannot serve as a policy advocate", and thought that "without this degree of independence the Canadian Institute could well be seen as an extension of Government policy and enjoy little respectability in Canada or abroad." Representatives of Project Ploughshares and of the Canadian Conference of Bishops agreed that the Institute should be able to "criticize existing Government policies" and to "propose very clear action strategies to the Government."

Several others, however, argued that the Institute was not there to advise the Government but to express views and ideas from which the Government might benefit. Arthur Menzies believed it was essential that "policy on peace and security remain the responsibility of the elected Government of Canada." Admiral Falls put forward a similar view but expressed the hope that officials would profit from this research. Michael Shenstone, Assistant Deputy Minister in the Department of External Affairs, asked whether the Institute "will try to issue views . . . or whether they will see their main function in that sort of realm as commissioning one or several scholars to go out and do a paper" which would then be published under the author's name. He pointed out that it would be difficult for the Institute to issue *ex cathedra* pronouncements on policy" if its Board, as had been suggested, covered a wide range of viewpoints. It would, however, serve a useful function by providing the "raw materials" from which people "can form their own conclusions."

Professor David Cox agreed that the Institute "should not be activist" but should "provide information and a forum for people regardless of their views."

Finally, Mr. William H. Barton, formerly Canada's Ambassador to the United Nations and Representative to the Conference on Disarmament, and presently Chairman of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, expressed the following opinion:

"I venture to predict that from the outset there will be pressures to turn it (the Institute) into an advocacy organization. In my view this would be contrary to the stated aims of the legislation and detrimental to its success. The research it sponsors must be intellectually and academically sound. The discussion it encourages must speak for itself. The Institute should not take positions except on matters of fact."

The Standing Committee seems to have adopted

the theses that the Institute should seek influence through the quality of its studies for paragraph c) of Section 4 of the Act reads as follows:

"c) to study and propose ideas and policies for the enhancement of international peace and security; . . ."

This wording does not necessarily rule out the kind of activism discussed earlier. However, when the general debate and all the attendant circumstances are taken into account, one is led to conclude that the Act favours in-depth reflection, creative thought and solid and serious study resulting in sensible and well-balanced proposals which, thanks to their intrinsic value, will impress both the Government and the general public alike.

CONCLUSION

With the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security, the Government and the people of Canada have at their disposal an institution whose task is to enhance the relevance and the effectiveness of their initiatives in favour of international peace and security. In conducting this task, the Institute is required to examine and weigh carefully all the elements that can further progress towards this objective, not only the traditional military factors inherited from a troubled and tragic past on which the original draft of the Bill appeared to lay emphasis, but also, and perhaps more importantly, those events or situations, which in the final analysis lie at the origin of international conflict, serving as a pretext for such conflict, if not often as its justification.

This requirement for the Institute to give equal importance to the study of the root causes of war evolved during the Parliamentary debate, as we have seen, and resulted from the socio-political arguments injected into the discussion by non-governmental organizations.

One legitimate question can be asked by way of conclusion: should any of the four aspects (arms control, disarmament, defence and conflict resolution) be accorded priority by the Institute in its research, studies and operations? The answer would seem to be clear. The parliamentary debate shows that the Institute owes it, both to itself and to the community which gave it its mandate, to neglect none of the approaches that Parliament has identified as ways of helping the world community maintain international peace and security.

From May 1985 to July 1986 Gilles Grondin was a Fellow with the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. He retired from the Department of External Affairs in January 1986, following a long career during which time he served in Indochina, in the Canadian mission to the United Nations, New York, and with the United Nations in Korea, Senegal and Niger.

The views expressed in this paper are the author's own, and should not be taken to represent the views of the Institute and its Board of Directors.

This paper is published by the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. Additional copies or other titles may be obtained from the Institute at 307 Gilmour Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 0P7.

Le présent exposé est également publié en français

ANNEX

PERSONS WHO APPEARED BEFORE THE PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE

Anne ADELSON

Member of Co-ordinating Committee,
Toronto Disarmament Network

Norman ALCOCK

World Federalists of Canada

Carmela ALLEVATO

Vice-President, End the Arms Race

William BARTON

Former Ambassador to the United
Nations

George BELL

President, Canadian Institute of
Strategic Studies

J.L. BLACK

Director, Institute of Soviet & East
European Studies

Stanley BRIGHTWELL

Engineers for Nuclear Disarmament

Gordon BROADY

Member, Veterans for Multilateral
Nuclear Disarmament

John BRODERICK

Vice-President, End the Arms Race

Tony CLARK

Director, Social Action, Canadian
Conference of Catholic Bishops

David COX

Queen's University

Sylvain DUBOIS

Privy Council Office

Murielle DUCKWORTH

Voice of Women

M.B. DUFRESNE

Director, Social Action, Canadian
Conference of Catholic Bishops

William EPSTEIN

United Nations Institute for Training
and Research

Robert FALLS

Former Chairman, NATO Military
Committee

C.G. GIFFORD

Co-Founder, Veterans for Multilateral
Nuclear Disarmament

Lawrence HAGEN

Director of Research, Canadian
Centre for Arms Control and
Disarmament

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| John HUMPHREY President, Canadian Human Rights Foundation | Allan NEWCOMBE Director, Peace Research Institute-Dundas | Gerd SCHNEIDER Vice-President Ottawa Branch, Physicians for Social Responsibility |
| George IGNATIEFF Chancellor, University of Toronto | Hanna NEWCOMBE Peace Research Institute-Dundas | Michael SHENSTONE Assistant Deputy Minister, Political and International Security Affairs, Department of External Affairs |
| William JANSEN Director, Ottawa Branch, Mennonite Central Committee of Canada | Olivier NICOLOFF National Coordinator, Canadian Student Pugwash | Sarah SHORTEN President, Canadian Association of University Teachers |
| David JOHNSTON McGill University | Geoffrey PEARSON Former Canadian Ambassador to the Soviet Union | John SIGLER United Nations Association in Canada |
| Frank KENNEDY President, End the Arms Race | Robert PENNER Member of Co-ordinating Committee, Toronto Disarmament Network | Victor SIM Director, Canadian Association of University Teachers |
| Firdaus KHARAS Executive Director, United Nations Association in Canada | Beryl PLUMPTRE Chairman of the National Executive Committee, Canadian Institute of International Affairs | Gary SMITH Arms Control and Disarmament Division, Department of External Affairs |
| John LAMB Executive Director, Canadian Centre for Arms Control and Disarmament | Anatol RAPOORT President, Science for Peace | James STARK President, Operation Dismantle |
| Lewis M. LEACH Director, Canada-USSR Association | Jacques RASTOUL Executive Director, Canadian Institute of International Affairs | Koozma TARASOFF Chairman Ottawa Branch, Canada-USSR Association |
| Napoléon LEBLANC Director, Centre québécois de relations internationales | Ed REGAN President Ottawa Branch, Physicians for Social Responsibility | Murray M. THOMSON Education Coordinator, Project Ploughshares |
| René J.A. LÉVESQUE University of Montreal | Ernie REGEHR Mennonite Central Committee of Canada | Brian W. TOMLIN Director, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs |
| Kay MACPHERSON Voice of Women | Douglas ROCHE Member of Parliament, International President, Parliamentarians for World Order | John WILKINSON Operation Dismantle |
| Nicolas M. MATTE Director, Centre for Research of Air and Space Law, McGill University | Alan ROSE Executive Vice-President, Canadian Jewish Congress | Henry WISEMAN University of Guelph |
| Arthur MENZIES Former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament | Louis SABOURIN Groupe d'étude de recherches et de formation professionnelles | Bernard WOOD Director, North-South Institute |
| Jim MITCHELL Privy Council Office | Qussai SAMAK Canadian Arab Federation | Gerald WRIGHT Vice-President, Donner Canadian Foundation |
| Dennis MURPHY Secretary General, Canadian Conference of Catholic Bishops | | Roger YOUNG Senior Research Officer, North-South Institute |
| M.V. NAIDU Canadian Peace Research and Educational Association | | |